REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 16-17, 20-27 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peled. In response, claim 1 has been amended to define further details about the subject matter of the criterion instruction and the associated instructions. Specifically, this system stores trace information in the form of a criterion instruction and an associated instruction. This is based on the recognition that certain kinds of instructions, such as branch instructions, may be executed over and over again, but using different parameters. In order to accommodate this situation, the trace information is stored in the form of criterion instructions that are part of a program sequence, and associated information that is data dependent on the criterion instructions. Claim 24 has been cancelled, and new claim 32 is substituted herein, which specifies that there are multiple associated instructions associated with the criterion instructions. This obviates the rejection over Peled.

Peled does show caching trace segments with multiple entry points. The trace segments are formed as explained in column 4,

as including a trace segment head, body and tail. There is also a trace segment table. However, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of claim 1, and specifically that the information about the trace is saved as criterion information and associated information, and that the processor associates the first information with the criterion information to form trace information. This is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable along with the claims which depend therefrom.

Claims 31-34 should be specifically allowable, as they define specific aspects of what is possible according to this architecture. Again, these are in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Claim 20 has also been amended to define the additional instructions, and that the criterion instructions are interpreted according to these additional instructions. Again, as described above, this is in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art, and therefore should be allowable thereover.

Claims 35-37 depend from claim 20 and should be allowable along with claim 20 for similar reasons to those discussed above.

Claim 29 has been amended in a similar way, and should be similarly allowable for similar reasons to those discussed above

with respect to claim 20, along with the claims which depend therefrom, and the new claims 38-40 which depend from amended claim 29.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Attorney Docket No. 10559-401001
Application No. 09/823,235
Amendment dated April 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated January 14, 2004

Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 04/12/2004

Scott C. Harris
Attorney for Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10385094.doc